People's participation in urban and regional planning

Schrader, Heiko

Veröffentlichungsversion / Published Version
Arbeitspapier / working paper

Universität Bielefeld
Fakultät für Soziologie

Forschungsschwerpunkt
Entwicklungssoziologie

University of Bielefeld
Faculty of Sociology

Sociology of Development
Research Centre

Universität Bielefeld - Postfach 100 131 - 33501 Bielefeld - Federal Republic of Germany - Tel.(0521)106-4650/4221
Fax (0521)106-2980

WORKING PAPER N^{o} 270

People's Participation in Urban and Regional Planning

Heiko Schrader

Bielefeld

ISSN 0936-3408

0. INTRODUCTION[1]

Nowadays terms such as 'civil society', 'integrated development' or 'participatory planning' are catchwords in the literature to development planning. They reflect the point of view that, for a long time, development policy and planning neglected local knowledge and interest of the people to whom it should serve and instead attached Western-biased concepts to the Third World. To-date it is common knowledge that planning and policy from above or from outside are an insufficient means for development, because central governments and donor agencies have limited personal and financial resources. 'In order that the development be self-sustained, it is of special importance that the members of the target group *participate* (...) in designing and operating a program that involves so many of them' (The World Bank 1975: 17-18, emphasis added by the author).

Participation of the population also implies a new approach from the planning as well as the beneficiary's side. 'No more feelings of superiority on part of the representatives of central institutions (and foreign experts), and no more feelings of inferiority on part of the ultimate local beneficiaries of development' (Bergmann 1989: 17). This perspective which seems self-comprehensive from a contemporary point of view is, however, the result of errors, experience and experimentation with, and reflection on, a number of partly even opposed development approaches and theories.

In part 1 of this paper I shall shortly consider the paradigmatic changes of development policy and theory, which finally led into the concept of participatory development and planning. In part 2 I shall investigate the concept of participatory planning with a particular emphasis on urban development. Part 3 shall provide examples of participatory projects in Asia.

1. THE BIRTH OF THE IDEA OF PARTICIPATORY DEVELOPMENT[2]

Development policy and development planning are a post-Second World War feature that emerged as an off-spring of colonial policy. It aimed at modernizing economy and culture of the particular country, whereas modernization and Westernization were used as interchangeable items. Modernization theories were predominant during the 1950s and 1960s and accepted by both development planners and most Third-World politicians and elites. Interpreting Western European history in a positivist way, modernization was considered a single-directed process from an undeveloped condition to progress. The underlying assumption was that development was planable (Tinbergen 1964).

The first UN development decade from 1960 to 1970 echoed the assumptions of modernization theorists. Industrial growth might have positive 'trickle-down' effects to other

---

1 This paper is based on a report to GTZ from September 1996 on theories, methods and projects in urban and regional planning.

2 Here I roughly follow Bongartz (1989, 1993).

economic sectors and common people by generating income-earning activities, infrastructural improvements, and the like. Impediments to development were presumed to be endogenous in nature. Third-World governments should take their role as 'modernizers' with master planning to eliminate economic and social distortions of the market. Trapped in a positivist thinking, modernization theory seemed to guarantee self-perpetuated growth. Such a political climate did not provide opportunities for the participation of the population and their demands in the development process.

In the early 1970s, however, it became obvious that the neoclassical models of Third-World development did not produce many success stories. Indeed, in general, growth rates of the GNP had been achieved, but development policy was a failure with regard to redistributive effects. Instead of leading to balanced growth, the outcome was an even more unbalanced income distribution, an increased land-city migration and the emergence of new urban squatter settlements of rural people in search of income opportunities. Therefore the focus shifted from a top-down to a bottom-up development strategy, which contains early ideas of popular participation.

The concept of **community development** has its roots in the UK and the US laborers' quarters of the nineteenth century and was a subject of social work but soon universally applied (Abbott 1995: 159ff.). It was elaborated by the British colonial government as an instrument of indirect rule to mobilize indigenous labor to support national government objectives and increase 'self-reliance' (Pratt and Boyden 1985: 141).

During the 1950s community development was treated as a synonym for community participation (Moser 1989: 81). The key issue of community development was that communities have an inherent potential to develop (Marsden and Oakley 1982: 187) and engender economic and social progress for the whole community. While the British, with regard to independence of their colonies, linked community development to a process of democratization and local initiative, many Third-World politicians considered the concept as an attempt to create institutions on the grounds of colonial social structure and as a strategy of neo-colonialism to maintain the former influence by simultaneously taking up a strategy against the expansion of the Communist ideology among the poor. The United Nations (1971) combined the strategy of community development with governmental development projects to improve the living conditions of the people. The idea was born that governments provide technical and other services, while the people actively participate in planning and decision-making. However, the approach still shared the prejudice of modernization theorists that villagers were backward and ignorant.

In spite of taking the perspective of the local people, the community development approach on a whole was rather unsuccessful. One main misconception was the implicit assumption of homogeneous, non-stratified communities, another one an insufficient discourse between planners and local people. Furthermore, government agencies misused the concept to extend their influence on the village level, and primarily local elites benefited from, and took the key positions in, the projects.

According to Abbott (1995: 158ff.) there are nowadays three distinct views on the relation between community development and participation: The first one considers community development as being superseded by community participation (De Kadt 1982).

The second view holds the old perspective that both features are basically the same, but that community development has gone out of fashion (Sheng 1990: 57), and according to the third community development is a particular form of participation, but there are different views of its application (e.g. Lones and Wiggle 1987; Ekong and Sekoya 1982; Waseem 1982).

The community development approach laid the grounds for the shift of paradigms in the 1970s during the second UN development decade. On the theoretical level, modernization theory had become criticized by a number of scholars from industrial as well as Third-World countries. Basic feature of the theoretical discussion was a new understanding of underdevelopment as a result of structural violence, the reason for underdevelopment being exogenous in nature: The industrial countries had been able to develop at the expense of the Third World. Theories based on exploitative relations came to be known as dependency theories and world system theory. The assessment of the theorists of how the dual structure could be overcome was partly very pessimistic, partly called for strategies such as collective self-reliance and dissociation. Characteristic feature of these approaches is the element of solidarity among the Third World to counter-balance the power of the industrialized world. Today this approach has gained prominence again within the framework of regional cooperation (Bhargava et al. 1995).

The second UN development decade from 1970 to 1980 retained the goal of economic growth, but called the top-down strategy of macro-planning of the 1960s into question by shifting the focus to poverty and basic-needs provision. The so-called basic needs approach (ILO 1976, Streethen et al. 1981) was a bottom-up strategy. It put a particular emphasis to popular participation as a means of action for meeting basic needs. A modified version which came up during the second development decade was community participation (United Nations 1971, 1975).

Not only because of its goals, but particularly because the older growth strategies were continued under its heading, the basic needs concept was heavily criticized. It was generally agreed that development aid should be provided as an aid for self-help efforts, however, here the similarities ended. The main critic came from the Third-World countries by arguing that the focus shift from macro-planning to basic needs satisfaction and the poor kept them backward and neglected their priority goals, particularly infrastructural improvements and industrialization. What they did not mention was that the ILO's and other organizations' claims for structural reforms, participation and empowerment of poor target groups called the income distribution and power constellations into question (Nuscheler 1995: 186-7).

The self-help concept which is still up-to-date, is an outcome of the community development and basic needs approach and poverty-oriented. It dissolved the dissatisfying aggregation of a homogeneous community and instead refers to target groups, taking the stratification of communities into consideration. According to Bongartz (1993: 9ff.) its major aims and objectives are 'empowerment' and 'participation' in the sense of direct involvement of the population in the decision-making process at different levels. One major issue of the concept was of how self-help and participation of the rural and urban poor could be achieved. It was recognized that the socio-economic conditions (income

distribution, stratification, power structure) were the main obstacles to bottom-up development. Instead of taking a sectoral approach, the focus was shifted to particular beneficiaries. Nowadays it is commonly agreed that participation and development are a couplet. According to Nuscheler (1995: 195) the categorical imperative of participation has been condensed in the term 'participatory development'. It includes the related concepts of 'empowerment' and 'civil society'.

2. CONTEMPORARY VIEWS OF PARTICIPATION

2.1. General Remarks

Human history is characterized by the struggle between the desire that people should participate and a lack of belief in their capacity to do so (Pasmore and Fagans 1992: 377). The present discussion holds that participation requires not a 'blueprint' approach but is a demand-driven process of learning in, and from the specific situation (Schneider and Libercier 1995: 9). The concept, however, is not clear-cut (Denise and Harris 1990) and unspecified. Most definitions include elements that could be classified under general topics such as (economic, social, cultural, environmental) 'change', 'equity', 'capacity building', 'sustainability', 'good life' and 'good governance'. To provide some examples:

Participation is defined 'as the active involvement of people in the making and implementation of decisions at all levels and forms of political and socio-economic activities' (Lisk 1985: 15), 'throughout the project or program cycle, from the design stage through monitoring and evaluation. Mere consultation of the people should no longer be considered as sufficient, nor should participation be limited to the implementation of activities previously defined from the outside' (Schneider and Libercier 1995: 10).

Popular participation implies (i) popular influence on political decisions which concern the allocation and utilization of productive resources; (ii) the need for popular involvement in the planning and implementation of activities that engender socio-economic opportunities for raising productive employment, income levels, and people's well-being; an (iii) and improved access of the poor to key productive assets and essential public services and facilities. It may bring about a decentralization of administrative powers and resources to the local level (Lisk 1985: 16; Valk and Wekwete 1990).

2.2. Models of Participation and Decision-Making

Participation includes a wide range of forms that may be institutionalized (members in the boards of planning) or spontaneous (people's movements, interest groups, demonstrations, etc.) (Aleman 1975: 84). Two decision-making processes relate to participatory planning: legislative and interest group decision-making (Burke 1979: 76ff.). The former type of decision-making follows the historic tradition from Greek democracy to parliamentary and participatory democracy. The basic concern is that citizens or their representatives share the process of decision-making. The outcome of such decisions

follows the majority principle and a long-term process of discussion, bargaining, persuasion and horse trading. It is legislative and assumed to serve the public interest. Such a rationale overlooks the personal interest of representatives and their embeddedness in social strata, occupational backgrounds, political parties and interest groups.

Interest group decision-making, on the other hand, is based upon the principles of public interest orientation and consensus. An interest group is a means for organizing opinion and action either to achieve a specific goal or to protect an existing one. It has no legal authority to set its interest through by force and has to find a consensus (which does not mean here that everybody is fully convinced. Interest groups are either geographical communities like neighborhoods who are affected by a particular plan or feel a particular need which they claim to be fulfilled by the authorities (e.g. the necessity of a new kindergarten or school or a lack of safety); or they are functional communities with a shared interest and the objective to extend their influence. From a realistic point of view, planners and bureaucrats largely act on behalf of interest groups such as the Chamber of Commerce, the interest of certain industries, labor organizations, and so on. The benefits and costs of a decision are not equally distributed among the population. The asymmetry of chances to participate and to influence decisions is one core problem in participatory planning. Socially weak, unorganized strata are in a disadvantaged position compared to well-educated and organized ones who, furthermore, can rely on their financial resources to support their interests. The political decision process can be considered as a quarrel of different interest groups with different powers for the recognition of their private interests as a public one (Thomaßen 1988: 18; Burke 1979: 76ff.).

Burke (1979: 74ff.) outlines five major roles that people can take in planning. These are, with an increasing degree of participation: (i) review and comment of proposed plans by public hearings etc.; (ii) consultation of selected citizens; (iii) advisory of selected citizens into the planning committee; (iv): shared decision-making of planners and participants (partnership in planning); and (v) controlled decision making, citizens exercising final authority over the planning decisions. The current discussion of participatory planning particularly centers around the last two models of participation.

Participatory approaches are either applied as a method or an end in itself. Participation as a method concerns, first of all, the benefits of a project. Budgetary constraints led to the idea of participation in cost sharing (self-help effort of the beneficiaries). The topic got a new dimension under the heading of sustainability. Secondly, it aims at partnership built upon the basis of a dialogue among the various actors (stakeholders), during which the agenda is set jointly, and local views and indigenous knowledge are deliberately sought and respected. While partnership also refers to certain political aspects, it takes an instrumental function for an easier acceptance of a project, better information, faster implementation and lower costs (e.g. Oakley et al. 1991).

2.3. Participation and Stratification

Community development and community participation programs have been criticized that they take unrealistic assumptions of a homogeneous community. Nowadays, how

ever, most such approaches assume stratified, sometimes even segmented, communities, consisting of interest groups and local elites, among other segments, which might capture the benefits of the projects (Uphoff 1985; Boaden et al. 1980: 19-20, 85).

Recent theorizing which is based upon empirical findings, considers emerging and declining coalitions within the process of socio-political and socio-economic change. An application of this concept to the process of participatory planning might produce very pessimistic results with regard to the articulation of interests of the poor in planning (Evers and Schiel 1988, passim). Similar evidence provides an empirical study on Indian slum-upgrading (Asthana 1994). It reveals a strong clientelism, vertical links of community leaders to local politicians who promise their dwellers' votes in return for public or private resources (a city's patron-clientelist network). The other way around, faith to such links and political patronage makes the slum dwellers more vulnerable to exploitation. For example, an established practice is, that upgraded slums become a speculative commodity and sometimes lead to illegal, forced expulsion (Berner 1996; Korff 1986).

2.4. Women and Participation[3]

A number of NGO and other agency manuals provide advice how to mobilize women and improve their technological knowledge. Mayoux (1996) argues that their number involved in projects cannot jump the barriers in gender inequalities with regard to resource access, time availability and power within and outside the family. Particularly many mixed-sex organizations and agencies indicate a marginal role of women. Gender relations create the following tensions in participatory projects:

- Women have many different, interrelated but often conflicting 'needs' to men. The immediately observable 'practical needs' concern the underlying and interlinked systems of inequalities such as class, age and ethnicity. Additionally, gender inequalities are further supported by ideological, religious and cultural systems.
- The barriers to women's participation are enormous. Membership criteria are often assigned to male norms, ownership or pooling of resources (which exclude very poor and/or married women), or formal education. With regard to mixed-sex projects, in a number of societies women/wives are socially prohibited to interact with men or in the public.
- In case that women form their own projects such as revolving funds, men take an ambivalent attitude. On one hand they admire the women/their wives for taking efforts and responsibility, on the other hand they suspect opposition to the traditional role distribution. Therefore, women's participation may also raise conflicts within the household.
- Women-only projects very often concern activities, which males are not interested in or which have low status. Those organizations which were quite successful in

3 See also Williams (1994); Guijt (1992); Reijntjes et al. (1992); Thomas-Slayter et al. (1993).

women's participatory development, took an uncompromising pro women stance. Many government or NGO women's programs are less radical than those of women's grassroots organizations in the same countries (Mayoux 1996: 242-252).

2.5. The Political Dimension of Participation

The political dimension refers to participation as an end in itself. It is generally agreed that an overall climate in which people can freely organize themselves into action groups for the announcement of their interests, is favorable for participation. This is the '**empowerment** approach'. According to Friedman (1992) empowerment means the formation of a counter-power to oligarchic power groups, which may challenge existing power structures. This approach which is more left-wing and NGO oriented, particularly emphasizes the empowerment of poor people and women by forming interest groups (see also Burkey 1993; Sen 1990; Calman 1992; Wieringa 1994). The discussion of the political dimension of participation is closely linked with the issues of civil society and the Communitarianist movement, which shall be considered now.

The concept of '**civil society**' is related to the question of 'good life', whereas there is disagreement of its quality. Following Walzer (1995) leftists argue that the preferred setting for the good life is the democratic state, with free and politically participating citizens. Quite different is the neoliberal perspective which considers the marketplace and consumerism as the framework for good life (whereas the role of the state is minimized). Again another answer is provided by rightist nationalists. For them the place for good life is the nation, in which citizens are bound together by blood and shared history, by birth (ascription), but not by choice. Here good life is more a matter of identity rather than activity.

The recent location of good life is 'civil society'. According to Lachenmann (1995: 2) it is a postulate or utopia of a not yet realized project of modernity, which is based on public control of power and permanent negotiation of possibilities to participate. Scholars largely agree that it is the 'third sector' - the public sphere between state and economy on the one hand, and the private sphere of family, friendships, personality, and intimacy on the other (Adamson 1987: 320). This view based upon the Gramsican perspective.

Closely in line with the concept of civil society is **Communitarianism**, the self-understanding of which is to improve society's moral, social and political environment. Communitarianists do not want to reinstall the traditional community à la Tönnies or Durkheim with all its constraints. Instead they argue that free individuals require a community which protects them from governmental infringements and strengthens morality. The Communitarianist concept is closely related to Habermas/Apel's discourse ethic (Etzioni 1995: 3, 18-19). Selznik (1995: 129ff.) outlines four principles of a Communitarianist democracy: (1) the emphasis on sovereignty of the people as a whole; (2) primacy of the community over the state; (3) responsibility of the government for the well-being of the community, subsequent to principle 2; and (4) social and political participation, not as a mass democracy, but as a communal democracy which is related to stable social networks that articulate their own interests.

According to Nuscheler (1995: 196) both the concepts of civil society and Communitarianism which are based on basic-democratic structures and a 'weak state' are too romantic and have a Western bias. Not only these, but all concepts of participation are confronted with the goal conflict between a necessary minimum of efficiency and a desirable optimum of self-responsibility and root organizations. The romantic of a village democracy cannot master the acute problems of developing countries. State interference in the market, where unintended results and serious power imbalances occurred, and an incorruptibility of bureaucrats were among the reasons why the modern democratic state has become a strong state in the Weberian sense, having a legitimate monopoly of force and accepting human rights. Only such a state is able to temporarily reduce its presence without loosing power, but not many weak states in the Third World.

2.6. Participation and Institution Building

Institution building is a component of the empowerment approach to represent powerless people. It refers to formal and informal institutions. Unfortunately, scholars in the tradition of *New Institutional Economics* implicitly assume that indigenous institutions - as far as they exist - are inefficient and have to be replaced by more efficient, Western-type ones (Krahnen and Schmidt 1994). For the matter of participation, however, existing, indigenously developed institutions are similarly important. Recent research in Philippine squatter settlements (Berner 1995), for example, found that it is exactly the capacity of slum dwellers to form neighborhood associations in their localities for the sake of habitat defense which protects them from eviction. However, to be effective, cohesion requires patterns of shared identity such as neighborhood, ethnicity or place of origin. To be poor is no sufficient criterion. Case studies from Latin America reveal that extreme poverty and shared identity has engendered new organizations and movements laying claim to greater involvement in development plans and decision-making. They can potentially achieve self-empowerment from below (Fadda 1991: 322). The formalization of informal institutions, however, might correlate with a loss of spontaneity and decreasing effectiveness (Majeres 1985: 35-37).

A general survey on grassroots-level popular organizations (Hughes 1985: 67-76) reveals that self-help associations are particularly forced where the government lacks resources for local development. Their activities mainly concern the provision of common services (schools, water supply, clinics, or churches). Sometimes they cooperate with the government in so far that the latter provides funds and/or material, while the self-help group provides labour inputs and local knowledge. However, self-help groups may be instrumentalized by influential interest groups and power holders for their own interests, or they may take wrong decisions because of a very narrow view on their particular context which is incompatible with higher-level development plans or even harmful for other people in their environment. Other forms of basis-democratic representation are cooperative enterprises or labor unions. The latter two institutions may be corrupted by power-holding interest groups such as the military, the latter even prohibited by law.

While older approaches to self-help of the poor assume that poor people are incapable to save, recent studies have discovered that exactly their savings capacity has to be supported. Examples are the wide-spread revolving funds and rotating savings and credit associations (see Schrader 1991). Although many of these are nowadays commercially oriented, many of them run an additional self-help fund.

Efforts in institution building for the purpose of participation should start at the grassroots level rather than on higher ones. They should first of all recognize which indigenous institutions and organizations are existent and reflect whether these could be linked, with or without reorganization, with other ones to form networks and bundle their interests to articulate them on higher levels. Examples are regional and national NGO umbrella organizations and their international forums.

2.7. Obstacles to Participation

In principle a number of roots organizations and institutions have the potential to politically participate. In practice, however, this potential is unused, misused or restricted:

- unused because of lack of experience of the grassroots institutions and lack of education of their members to express their needs and interest; lack of support from planners and government agents in identifying goals and bottlenecks; or simply unwillingness to take part in political decision-making and planning out of a feeling of helplessness compared with bureaucrats and planners;
- misused by the state as a means of system stabilization (Rüland 1988: 33f.) or for personal benefits and clientelism of powerful individuals or interest groups;
- restricted because of autocratic administrative structures, hierarchies and rigidities of planning or development agencies and legitimized with the requirement to specialists' inputs into the planning process;[4] an expectation that participation delays the implementation process and the power holders' suspicion of struggle from below.

The result are 'closed' planning institutions with restricted membership such as national or regional planning commissions. Even in case that planning is decentralized and decision-making shifted to lower levels according to the principle of subsidiarity, the idea of participation is often alienated on these levels (Majeres 1985: 31). Therefore participation is very often the outcome of even violent 'encounters' between power holders on one hand, and deprived people on the other (Fadda 1991: 319ff.). Powerless people organize themselves, proclaim their interests, and eventually push through the right to participate.

Another limitation which deserves mention is different perceptions of indigenous people, administrators and planners of what constitutes participation and planning (e.g. Lowder 1993: 1242). The cultural anthropologist Stone (1989) argues that already the approach of community participation has a Western bias. It has been transferred with time lag to developing countries, however, may cause problems because of a different

4 See also Fedon (1996).

connotation in another culture. This Western bias is on individualism, self-reliance and equity, values which are not automatically shared universally (see later).

Rinke (1984: 8) considers to-date planning as an emancipatory and communicative action, which is just opposite to its older, technocratic understanding. It roughly fits Habermas' (1973) communicative planning and includes not only what is technically and economically possible, but also socially acceptable and/or desirable. Planning dissolves the distance between planner and target group; there are participants only. Planning aims at processes of agreement concerning goals and restrictions. Decisions are made according to democratic processes and insights. Communicative planning requires participation and discourse of citizens with planners and bureaucrats in all periods of planning.

2.8. Citizen Participation in Urban Development and Planning

During the post-war decade urban growth and urbanization processes have been dramatic, particularly in developing countries, and the 1996 Habitat Conference took up the issue for discussion. Estimates prognosticate a world urban population of 2 billion for the near future. More than 50% of them (in some countries almost 80%) live in substandard, overcrowded conditions and in extreme poverty in illegal settlements on public or private land (Hardoy and Satterwaite 1989). In contrast to these dimensions the urban poor, contrary to the rural poor in the Third World, have so far got comparatively little attention (e.g. Evers 1991, 1993). Development policy and projects had a rural bias, and with regard to poverty a common argument was that the living conditions of the rural poor are much harder. Recent investigations and statistics, however, indicate the real degree of urban poverty (UNDP 1990; Asthana 1994: 58). Literature on social planning in developing countries and urban participation is therefore a rather recent phenomenon (e.g. Philipps and Yeh 1987). This discourse, however, is shaped to some extent by a discussion of citizen participation in urban development and planning, which was an important topic in the industrial countries in the 1960s and 1970s and shall be investigated now. It parallels the general discussion on participation.

The European discourse on planning started with the efficiency and effectiveness of planning systems, and later took up the issue of public participation. Bureaucrats were perceived as 'servants of the public', neglecting that these have own interests as individuals and members of social groups and organizations. Furthermore, this assumed relation between people and government presupposes a government with an established monopoly of force which lacks a number of Third-World governments. Prior to the 1950s community planning was solely a matter of city planning agencies and departments and primarily concerned physical, land-use matters.[5] Within the planning process the particular role of the planner was unquestioned. He was the professional expert whose opinion and decision reflected the needs and interests of the community,

5 Here I follow Burke (1979: 67ff.).

and he had the skills to decide the best alternative. Mischance in planning was the result of unfortunate external influences. Human services and social planning were almost non-existent.

Since the 1950s, however, three topics have come up which have decisively influenced the conception of city planning. These are functional planning agencies (health, community development, environmental planning, etc.), a changed decision environment, and citizen participation. In addition to land use, a number of topics have been taken up: housing, transport, the environment, social welfare, and so on. The main focus of planning shifted from goal orientation to problem orientation, and the emphasis from centralization of planning to decentralization.

Nowadays it is generally accepted that planning takes place under conditions of uncertainty. It is understood as being part of a process of social change that depends on the participation of citizens and groups. Participatory planning in the old industrialized countries has emerged as a matter of civil rights. In America the focus on urban renewal (slum redevelopment, rehabilitation of homes and businesses) engendered renewal agencies, according to which citizen participation meant to include 'citizen leaders' in the process of planning. Grassroots or large-scale participation in planning were not yet matter of concern. During these years participation was a mere technique which should contribute to an easier achievement of the targets. However, during the 1960s and 1970s the perspective changed, particularly focusing the poor and racial aspects in the American and British metropolises. Participation was discussed controversially. According to Spiegel (1969: 6ff.) more conservative scholars wanted to maintain the status quo by arguing that public and private interests are two pairs of shoes. They held that government authorities and planners serve public interests, while private interests overshadow participation and hinder the most beneficial public outcomes or even block the planning and implementation process. More progressive scholars, however, took up topics which are still discussed (e.g. Marris and Rein 1967). Kotler's (1967) perspective already comes close to the empowerment approach. He takes position for participation of the poor in planning and considered them as combatants against the bureaucracy.

The discussion on urban development planning in early-1990 Germany (see Korff 1995) is not much further than the progressive writers in the 1960s with regard to theoretical standpoints, while ecological and global aspects have been added to the perspective. From a sociologist’s point of view they neglect that the informal sector is no longer a phenomenon of the Third World but belongs to the post-industrial, and particularly global, city (see Sassen 1991, 1994; Castells 1991).

According to Balbo (1993: 23ff.) master planning and planning techniques are unsuitable to Third-World cities, because they expand very rapidly and uncontrolled. Those who are concerned with urban planning in the Third World have to be realistic: 'The Third-World city is a fragmented city, where urbanization takes place in leaps and bounds, creating a continuously discontinuous pattern. In the fragmented city, physical environment, services, income, cultural values and institutional systems can vary markedly from neighborhood to neighborhood, often from street to street' (Balbo 1993: 24). The provision of housing, infrastructure and services, cannot keep up with this rapid population growth.

Balbo continues that the ideology of urban planning in industrialized countries looks at the city as a homogeneous object and equality as a basic measure. Everybody shall have access to the same services. In Third-World cities such a view is far away from reality. One constraint, for example, are the scarce resources. The state therefore takes a role of inclusion and exclusion. It defines what is legal and illegal, distributes finances, provides licenses, sets standards, and so on. As a matter of fact, however, fragmentation often results from the inability of the state to follow the rules it has set: a settlement is illegal, because public housing is scarce. Access to water, electricity and public transport are no basic rights of the citizens; they have to be negotiated with the power holders. 'The periodic demolition of squatter settlements, as well as the clean-up programs by which street vendors and show-cleaners are removed from the city center, are certainly decided according to the economic appetite of some local businessman or politician (or both) or the modernization wave that springs up every now and then. Most often, though, they are a means for the currently dominant social groups to reaffirm their power, frequently more for ethnic, religious or political antagonisms than for economic ones' (Balbo 1993: 29).

Fragmentation is probably a condition that engenders formal and informal networks of mutual help and interest around local topics - a fact that explains why mega cities do not collapse. 'The question must be asked whether in reality fragmentation is not only a mechanism of exclusion, but also and foremost a means of resource redistribution and political dynamization, although unintentional (Balbo 1993: 32).

2.9. The Planning Process

The planning process consists of the following phases:[6]

- problem definition phase: diagnosis of the nature of the problem and possible solutions and organization of the planning team. Ideally this phase involves social scientists and techniques such as participatory appraisal to collect information from the grassroots level.
- goal-setting phase: the understanding of the problem, the unsatisfied needs and desirable and feasible solutions to the problem. The judgment is provided by the planning team and can include citizen participation in the form of discussion circles and surveys.
- determining the elements of a plan: specify the means to achieve the goals to produce a concrete plan.
- achieving acceptance of a plan: a decision-making diagnostic assessment to analyze the forces for and against the plan and to select the most appropriate strategy to achieve acceptance of the plan. Simplified here, there are two ways to achieve

6 Here I follow Burke's (1979: 155f.) basic scheme and add possible ways of participatory planning.

acceptance: by agreement or by compromise. Techniques to achieve either acceptance or compromise are such as presenting the plan to the public by a campaign, identify potentials to objection and invite them for discussions to convince them, persuade them, overpower them, bargain with them or take their suggestions seriously as a means to modify and alternate the plan. Participation can take the function of monitoring.

- implementing a plan: the planning of methods and procedures to ensure that the plan is carried out. Typical obstacles to implementation are a lack of resources, a lack of demand, a lack of acceptance, and false assumptions concerning the decision environment. It is conventional wisdom of contemporary planning that, the more popular participation and public discussion of a plan took place and resulted in compromise or agreement, the more easily the plan will be implemented.
- evaluating a plan: This includes a phase of operation of the plan in which the unworkable elements of the plan are identified. This requires the decision of whether or not the plan has to be modified.

Two methods of present participatory planning are target-oriented project planning (ZOPP) and rapid urban environment assessment.

3. Practical Fields of Experience with Participatory Planning in Developing Countries

In the last part of the paper I would like to provide some examples of participatory projects from the following spheres: the environment, economic development, slum upgrading, public health and neighborhood organizations.

(a) Participation and the Environment

During the past decade participation has become a topic in environmental concerns. An example of interest is forestry. In India, for example, forestry has become a field of conflict between the state and private firms on one hand (which both have an interest to exploit the forest), and the indigenous people on the other, who have traditionally lived in the forest and experience how their natural environment, their livelihood, is at stake. Communities in Uttar Pradesh and among them particularly women, mobilized themselves to stop illegal logging. They linked arms and encircled trees to prevent the cutting. The movement has become renowned as *Chipko*. This movement was successful in that commercial cutting has substantially declined (see Ford Foundation 1992, quoted by Bhattacharyya 1995). Another example is a present GTZ project in Orissa, which tries to involve local forest people in decisions in forestry.

(b) Integrated Urban Development - Two Cases from India

Calls for integrated urban development have been subsequent to such approaches in rural development. Instead of single-sector slum upgrading this approach aims at a multi-sectoral slum improvement (see Stephans and Harpham 1991). Asthana (1994: 58) emphasizes that an integrative approach is difficult in so far that 'hard' elements such as housing provision and infrastructure are always given higher priority by both planners and beneficiaries, while 'soft' ones relating to health, education and social development

rank lower. Therefore tensions exist between short-term, material goals and empowerment.

The Visakhapatnam Urban Community Development Project in Andra Pradesh is an integrated project that covers the entire slum population of the city. It puts a strong emphasis on community participation, organization and initiative. The activities include: environmental improvements, income generating schemes, health and educational projects, self-help housing and women empowerment. Its objectives are: creating social cohesion among neighbors through corporate civic activities; developing a community feeling through participation in community affairs; enabling people to solve problems using their own initiatives and organizations; bringing about a change in consciousness about their social and physical environment; developing local initiatives and identifying and training local leaders; and ensuring fuller utilization of technical and welfare services. The activities encompass physical infrastructure, housing, community development, economic, educational and social programs, and health. There is little participation in the planning and implementation phase of infrastructural programs, while a strong emphasis on participation is put to the maintenance of infrastructure: sweeping, clearing garbage, water drains and the community halls and undertaking simple repairs. Slum dwellers are given legal title to land (Asthana 1994: 60-61).

A similar project is the Indore Habitat Improvement Project. It was implemented in 1990 and refers to slum upgrading. The main emphasis of the project is that development is no packet that is delivered from outside sources but requires assistance by the target group. It involves the community in all stages of the project: on the decision-making level at the pre-planning and planning stages, through all phases of implementation, monitoring and evaluation, and through the post project sustenance. The project is structured as follows: The smallest grassroots-level working unit is the neighborhood group. Each selects a volunteer (Residential Community Volunteer) to represent the group in the *basti vikas mandal*, the Committee of Representatives which works out a neighborhood development plan. The key arenas of community involvement are (i) forming neighborhood groups; (ii) selecting volunteers; (iii) prioritizing needs; (iv) deciding input; (v) setting up and managing the functioning of the *basti vikas mandals*; and (vi) finishing mini plans, monitoring, implementation, evaluation and post-project sustenance. Each *basti vikas mandal* obtains a revolving fund, which is jointly operated by the community organizer of the locality and the president and secretary of the *basti vikas mandal*. The revolving funds provide loans to promising entrepreneurs from the community. In addition a number of *mahia mandals* offer skill training programs in cooperation with the project workers. There are also community managed primary education centers that charge a fee according to the abilities of the families. The community organizer helps to set up neighborhood groups by first identifying the areas and households which might fit together and form a viable and democratic neighborhood committee. They are advised what the purpose of such groups is. These groups get guidance, financial support and a regular flow of services to improve their living conditions. The Resident Community Volunteer is the spokesman/-woman of his/her neighborhood group and the backbone of the project. He takes grassroots problems to the *basti vikas mandal* level for discussion and support, and the decisions of the mandal and goals of the project are discussed in the neighborhood

groups. Another activity is the formation of community centers. The emphasis of the entire project is on self-help and community action, linking government efforts, the project efforts and those of the people to achieve development (Thudipara 1992).

(c) Human Settlement Planning and Community Participation in Indonesia

In Indonesia the provision of social housing is a rather recent phenomenon. The Kampung Improvement Program (KIP) which already started during the colonial period and has consistently been modified, is an integrated effort by the municipality and the community to improve the living standards in the urban kampung areas. As a matter of fact there is a rule that, the greater the funds available from the national government or donor agencies, the less important becomes community participation in the KIPs. Originally starting from Jakarta, the program has nowadays extended to more than 450 cities throughout the country. Community participation differs from one city and one kampung to another, as well as in the different project stages. Its success depends very much on the community leaders' capacity, who are the interface between planners and local people.

Soeyono (1992) provides the results of a case study in three Semarang *kampungs* which are based on popular participation and involve people's fund raising (monetary inputs and rice) and labor contributions. Two of these projects are self-initiated, one government-initiated. During the planning stage popular participation is largely restricted to assistance to the planning unit and provision of information. In the implementation phase, the community assists in negotiations with affected private people on matters of compensation, overseeing contractors, providing and guarding building materials, and providing labor and financial inputs. During the operation and maintenance stage, the community collects funds from its members to cover expenses.

(d) Community Participation in Squatter Settlements in the Philippines

In the Philippines Manila takes the role of the primate city. It is characterized by a consistent mass growth which includes a slum and squatter settlement extension (uncontrolled land use). During the past four decades the policy of the government towards squatter settlements has been ambivalent, ranging from resettlement and relocation and slum demolition to slum upgrading and, as it is practiced now by the National Housing Authority, joint venture arrangements with local governments, landowners, NGOs, and planners to improve the living conditions. The Community Mortgage Program provides loans to the slum dwellers to purchase the plot of land they squat or alternative land where they can resettle.

The existing housing policy is based on participation of the people in community development and nation-building which has been fixed in the 1987 constitution. NGOs, community-based or sectoral organizations got seats on the different administrative levels to participate in the planning process. Viloria (1992) describes experiences with participation in three projects. They support the general findings of other articles: the requirement to link participatory planning to the felt needs of the people and to the empowerment approach; and to improve the skills of the planners with regard to community development, management of multidisciplinary groups, acceptance of the people as full-scale partners, and the like.

(e) Participatory Development and Finance

A number of successful examples of participatory development are also available from the field of finance. Examples are the 17-year old Grameen Bank in Bangladesh, the Self-employed Women's Association (SEWA) in India, the Foundation for International Community Assistance (FINCA), the Trickle-Up Program (TUP), the Women's World Bank, the ACCION International, or the Working Capital (see Ford Foundation 1992). These programs involve lending and entrepreneurship development plans for the poor. Yunus' Grameen Bank has created more than 700,000 rural micro-entrepreneurs, mainly women. The Bank is a success story with very high recoveries (98%), contrary to a number of subsidized credit programs (see Schrader 1996, 1997). One particular aspect of the Bank is to make the mostly Muslim women self-reliant and to provide them with training courses and support services such as child care and literacy education. The Grameen Bank has spread from Bangladesh to a number of other countries. The SEWA bank is comparable to the work of Grameen Bank (see Aburdene and Naisbitt 1992). The FINCA, a non-profit voluntary organization, operates rural banks for the poor to build self-help, self-sufficiency and self-esteem. The TUP provides grants to micro enterprises. The Women's World Bank is a bank operating for women in Ghana (Bhattacharyya 1995).

(f) Participatory Development and Public Health

Public health is nowadays understood in a positive way and not as something that is missing. It is not the absence of disease, but a condition of well-being dependent on a number of physical, mental, and social factors. Community health systems are grounded on an educational model, based on people's felt needs and cognitive participation (see e.g. Rifkin 1985; Bichmann 1992; Stone 1992). So far evaluation and monitoring of health projects were bound to quantitative terms, often expressing the project target (such as cases of special diseases or availability of health services). Often these goals were not achieved and the projects interpreted as misconceptions. However, success has often been overlooked (for example, the mobilization of the local population). This highlights the importance of integrating qualitative measures as indicators for success which can reflect changes in attitudes and behaviors of community people (GTZ-Ithög 1991). The PAHO (1984: 23) suggests to training of the health staff in community-participation techniques, assessment of local conditions and establishment of formal mechanisms to include the community in the planning, decision making and implementation process.

(g) Rural Participatory Development in the Philippines

Eder (1994) presents a case in which policy tries to motivate forest people to participate in sustainable upland development programs. Since forest people do often belong to an indigenous, remote population, matters of ethnicity and majority-minority problems are touched. The author takes a look at the case of one upland development project of a local environmentalist organization, Haribon Palawan, in the Philippines to involve the Batak of Palawan Island in participation in upland field stabilization and other matters. The NGO accommodates indigenous cultural practices and appeals to Batak ethnic identity to encourage them to participate. With program success, indigenous Batak culture and ethnic identity have changed in so far that they have adapted to lowland Filipi

nos. The interesting argument of the paper is that cultural change in the direction of lowland Filipino lifeways is in fact what the Batak themselves want: to have such material things as the lowlanders: a better diet, more clothing, greater access to health services, and so on. At the same time, the Batak are very self-conscious about their culture. According to Eder's interpretation this is due to the fact that they discover ethnicity as an instrumental value of ethnic claims in obtaining desired resources as ethnic minorities. Eder rejects the assumption that the Batak will be absorbed by lowland Filipino culture. There are first of all racial distinctions of the Batak. Secondly, and equally important, it is the 'Batakness', the drawing on ethnic terms, which provides them access to certain resources, because they are a remote tribe.

(h) Different Perceptions of Participation and Development among Rural Nepalese

Already the approach of community participation which is nowadays an established development strategy, has a Western bias, so that the concept cannot necessarily be transferred into other cultures because the connotation may be different. The European bias is based on individualism, self-reliance and equity, values which are not automatically shared within other contexts. Stone's (1989) hypothesis is based on a study of the Tinau watershed development project in Nepal and the villagers' perception on development and participation. The culture of most Nepalese ethnic groups is hierarchical, based upon the local caste and kinship system and the interdependence of persons and groups. Contrary to an emphasis of the values of self-reliance, individualism and equality, there is - within the Nepalese context - an emphasis of mutual dependencies, human linkages and regulated exchanges between people and groups. This affects the perception of participation and planning. All project staff emphasized that development is closely related to behavioral change: adoption of new production techniques, modern health services, family planning, etc., or even an attitude when people realize that they can take initiative. The villagers by contrast, understood development (nep.: *bikas*) in a different way as concrete, visible objects such as the school, health post or water system. Although the government, in cooperation with development projects, provides educational 'messages' (posters, radio announcements), these were not considered as *bikas*. For the villagers development is something coming from the outside, not something that has been mobilized within the community. Stone further suggests that this view is no mere reflection of traditional development aid functions, but a cultural expression, the own social organization and ideology which is based upon principles such as hierarchy and human interdependence. The perception of development is that some high status members have the power to channel these resources into the village. The indigenous concept of participation, on the other hand, has a negative connotation for the villagers. It is linked to forced financial and labor recruitment by the government.

(i) Urban Violence and Neighborhood Organizations

Urban violence is a topic of concern in both developed and developing countries. It is treated by a number of scholars as an expression of alienation, uprootedness and individualization. While conventional policy was a mere reaction to crimes, recent approaches emphasize the aspect of crime prevention with community participation. Also the recent American Communitarianist movement considers the reinstalment of communities as an efficient mechanism against crimes. Examples of neighborhood

committees are found in America, but also in the Third World. In Bhimandi, India, the town has at least 70 such neighborhood committees, the members consisting of various social strata. In addition to neighbor watch they helped the police to overcome its alienation from the people. So the police assists the people in problems such as with the municipality, electricity department and ration shops (Bhattacharyya 1995).

4. CONCLUSIONS

The discussion of participation and participatory planning cannot be separated from its political dimension. Communities and societies are no homogeneous entities, as older approaches to community development assume, but stratified and even segmented. Different people have different chances in the politico-economic sphere, which is largely controlled by powerful interest groups and split up in clientelist systems. The call for participation means that people so far having been neglected in city planning or even excluded from the city (slum dwellers, squatters, peddlers and other informal-sector agents) are encouraged to join and institutionalize grassroots institutions and organizations to express their needs and pool their interests to counterbalance the existing power structure.

The paper demonstrates that a number of obstacles hinder this participation process; obstacles from the planners' and bureaucrats' sight such as prejudices and an expectation to lengthen the planning and implementation procedure; obstacles from the participants' sight such as lack of self-reliance or education, passiveness or helplessness; and obstacles due to different perceptions of planners and target people what constitutes development, participation and needs. However, obstacles can be overcome.

Indeed, a number of developing countries have taken up the requirement to participatory development in their constitutions and laws, but these measures are often insufficient means, since a number of techniques legitimize to maintain the old planning style by merely integrating people's information as a new component, without any possibility of the people to participate in decision-making. It is also certainly true that local planning is more appropriate to participation than regional or national planning. Even in such cases techniques such as rapid rural appraisal, participatory appraisal and urban environment assessment might have positive effects on participatory development, because they involve social scientists in data collection not only among, but with the people, and local representatives in the decision process (particularly in the participatory appraisal).

Participatory development requires an openness of planners and bureaucrats to people's participation and a willingness to become acquainted with social reality rather than sticking to planning from an air-conditioned glass house. It also requires to support the target group with educational programs in literacy and basis democracy. Some findings of case studies from slum development and financial grassroots organizations are very encouraging that poor, deprived people are not only willing, but also in the position to take decisions, while planners, bureaucrats and social workers take the role of mere advisors.

5. REFERENCES

Abbott, J. 1995: Community Participation and its Relationship to Community Development. *Community Development Journal* 30, 2: 159-168.

Aburdene, P. and J. Naisbitt 1992: *Megatrends for Women*. New York: Villard.

Adamson, W. 1987: Gramsci and the Politics of Civil Society. *Praxis International* 7, 3/4.

Alemann, U.v. 1975: Partizipation, Demokratisierung, Mitbestimmung - Zur Problematik eines Gegenstandes. Alemann, U.v. (Hg.): *Partizipation, Demokratisierung, Mitbestimmung*. Opladen.

Asthana 1994: Integrated Slum Improvement in Visakhapatnam, India. Problems and Prospects. *Habitat International* 18, 1: 57-70.

Balbo, M. 1993: Urban Planning and the Fragmented City of Developing Countries. *Third World Development Review* 15, 1: 23-35.

Bergmann, T. 1989: Participation of the Local Society in Development. *Regional Development Dialogue* 10. 2: 3-23.

Berner, E. 1995: Power Ressources and Dominance: A Critique and Reformulation of Strategic Group Analysis. Working Paper No. 218, Sociology of Development Research Center, University of Bielefeld.

Berner, E. 1996: Legalizing Squatters, Excluding the Poorest: Urban Land Transfer Programs in the Philippines. Working Paper No. 257. Sociology of Development Research Center, University of Bielefeld.

Bhargava, K.K., H. Bongartz and F. Sobhan (eds.) 1995: *Shaping South Asia's Future. Role of Regional Cooperation*. New Delhi: Vikas.

Bhattacharyya, J. 1995: Solidarity and Agency: Rethinking Community Development. *Human Organization* 54, 1: 60-69.

Bichmann, W. 1992: Community Involvement in Health Development: New Tasks for Medical Anthropology? *Curare* 15: 69-76.

Boaden, N. et al. 1980: Planning and Participation in Practice. A Study of Public Participation in Structural Planning. *Progress in Planning* 13: 1-102.

Bongartz, H. 1989: *Self-Help Organizations in Rural Java*. Bielefeld Studies on the Sociology of Development 42. Saarbrücken and Fort Lauderdale: Breitenbach.

Bongartz, H. 1993: *Development Theories, NGOs and Self-Help Organizations*. Nepal Foundation for Advanced Studies. Kathmandu.

Burke, E. 1979: *A Participatory Approach to Urban Planning*. New York: Human Sciences Press.

Burkey, S. 1993: *People First; A Guide to Self-Reliant, Participatory Rural Development*. London: ZED Press.

Calman, L.J. 1992: *Towards Empowerment: Women and Movement Politics in India*. Boulder and Oxford: Westview.

Castells, M. 1991: *The Informatinal City, Information, Technology, Economic Restructuring and the Urban-Regional Process*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Chalerm Koekungwal 1992: Current Human Settlement Situation in Thailand and Related Policies. *Regional Development Dialogue* 13, 4: 35-47.

De Kadt, E. 1982: Community Participation for Health: the Case of Latin America. *World Development* 10, 7: 573-584.

Denise, P.S. and I. Harris (eds.) 1990: *Experimental Education for Community Development*. New York: Greenwood Press.

Eder, J.F. 1994: State-Sponsored 'Participatory Development' and Tribal Filipino Ethnic Identity. *Social Analysis* 35: 28-38.

Ekong, E.E. and K.L. Sokoya 1982: Success and Failure of Rural Community Development Efforts: A Study of Two Cases in Southwestern Nigeria. *Community Development Journal* 17, 3: 217-224.

Esman, M.J. and N.T. Uphoff 1984: *Local Organizations*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

Etzioni, A. 1995: *Die Entdeckung des Gemeinwesens*. Stuttgart: Schäffer Poeschel.

Evers, H.-D. 1991: Ekonomi Bayangan, Produksi Subsisten dan Sektor Informal. Kegiatan Ekonomi di Luar Jangkauan Pasar dan Negara, *Prisma* 5: 21-30.

Evers, H.-D. 1993: Perubahan Kapasitas Penyerapan Tenaga Kerja di Sektor Informal, Populasi, *Buletin Penelitian Kebijaksanaan Kependudukan* 4,1: 24-32.

Evers, H.-D. and T. Schiel 1988: *Strategische Gruppen. Vergleichende Studien zu Staat, Bürokratie und Klassenbildung in der Dritten Welt.* Berlin: Reimer.

Fadda, G. 1991: Urban Participation in Caracas: An Unbalanced 'Encounter'. *Third World Planning Review* 13, 4: 319-333.

Fedon, P.L. 1996: The Rational Choice between Different Truths: A Dilemma of International Project Managers. Working Paper No. 245, Sociology of Development Research Centre, University of Bielefeld.

Ford Foundation 1992: *The Report*. Washington, DC: Ford Foundation.

Friedmann, J. 1992: *Empowerment*. Oxford and Cambridge, Mass.

GTZ-Ithög 1991: *Joint Working Group. Assessment of the District Health System using Qualitative Methods*. Heidelberg and Eschborn: GTZ-Ithög.

Guijt, I. 1992: *Gender Differences and PRA*. London: IJED.

Habermas, J. 1973: *Legitimationsprobleme im Spätkapitalismus*. Frankfurt/M.: Suhrkamp.

Hardoy, J.E. and D. Satterthwaite 1989: *Squatter Citizens: Life in the Urban Third World*. London: Earthscan.

Hughes, A. 1985: Alternative Forms and Levels of Popular Participation: A General Survey. F. Lisk (ed.): *Popular Participation in Planning for Basic Needs*. Aldershot, Hampshire: Gower.

ILO 1976: *Employment, Growth and Basic Needs*: A One World Problem. Geneva: ILO.

Korff, R. 1986: *Bangkok: Urban System and Everyday Life*. Bielefeld Studies on the Sociology of Development 31. Saarbrücken and Fort Lauderdale: Breitenbach.

Korff, R. 1995: Bereichsrezension Stadtplanung. *Soziologische Revue* 183: 445-452.

Kotler, M. 1967: Two Essays on the Neighborhood Corporation. Urban America: Goals and Problems. Materials Prepared for Subcommittee on Urban Affairs of the Joint Economic Committee, Congress of the United States, Washington, D.C.

Krahnen, J.P. and R.H. Schmidt 1994: *Development Finance as Institution Building*. Boulder, San Francisco and Oxford: Westview.

Lachenmann, G. 1995: Zivilgesellschaft und Entwicklung. Arbeitspapier Nr. 221. Forschungsschwerpunkt Entwicklungssoziologie.

Lisk, F. 1985: The Role of Popular Participation in Basic Needs-Oriented Development Planning. F. Lisk (ed.): *Popular Participation in Planning for Basic Needs*. Aldershot, Hampshire: Gower.

Lones, J. and I. Wiggle 1987: The Concept and Politics of 'Integrated Community Development'. *Community Development Journal* 22, 2: 107-117.

Lowder, S. 1993: The Limitations of Planned Land Development for Low-Income Housing in Third-World Cities. *Urban Studies* 30, 7: 1241-1255.

Majeres, J. 1985: Popular Participation in Decision Making with Reference to Development Planning: An Institutional Approach. F. Lisk (ed.): *Popular Participation in Planning for Basic Needs*. Aldershot, Hampshire: Gower.

Marris, P. and M. Rein 1967: *Dilemma of Social Reform*. London: Atherthon.

Marsden, D. and P. Oakley 1982: Editorial Introduction. *Community Development Journal* 17, 3: 186-189.

Mayoux, L. 1996: Beyond Naivity: Women, Gender, Inequality and Participatory Development. *Development and Change* 26: 235-258.

Moser, C.O.N. 1989: Community Participation in Urban Projects in the Third World. *Progress in Planning* 32, Part 2.

Nuscheler 1995: *Lern- und Arbeitsbuch Entwicklungspolitik* (4. Aufl.). Bonn: Dietz.

Oakley, P. et al. 1991: *Projects with People: The Practice of Participation in Rural Development*. Geneva: ILO.

PAHO 1984: *Community Participation in Health and Development in the Amercias. An Analysis of Selected Case Studies*. Washington, D.C:

Pasmore, W. and M.R. Fagans 1992: Participation, Individual Development, and Organizational Change: A Review and Synthesis. *Journal of Management* 18, 2: 375-397.

Philipps, D.R. and A.G.O. Yeh 1987: New Towns - The East and South East Asian Experience. In: D.R. Philipps and A.G.O. Yeh (eds.): *New Towns in Southeast Asia. Planning and Development*. Hong Kong etc.: Oxford University Press.

Pratt, B. and J.Boyden 1985: *The Field Directors' Handbook* (An Oxfam Manual for Development Workers). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Reijntjes, C. et al. 1992: *Farming for the Future: An Introduction to Low-External Input and Sustainable Agriculture*. Leusden: ILEIA.

Rifkin, S. 1985: *Health Planning and Community Participation. Case Studies in Southeast Asia*. London etc.: Croom Helm.

Rinke, R. 1984: *Partizipation und sozial-räumliche Planung öffentlicher Institutionen.* Frankfurt/M.: Haag und Herchen.

Rüland, J. 1988: A Critical Review of Theoretical Approaches to Urban Government in Southeast Asia. In: J. Rüland (ed.): *Urban Government and Development in Asia.* München etc.: Weltforum.

Sassen, S. 1991: *The Global City.* New York etc.: Princeton University Press.

Sassen, S. 1994: *Cities in a World Economy*. Thousand Oaks etc.: Pine Forge and Sage.

Schneider, H. and M.-H. Libercier 1995: Toward a New Partnership. In: H. Schneider and M.-H. Libercier (eds.): *Participatory Development: From Advocacy to Action* . Paris: OECD.

Schrader, H. 1991: Rotating Savings and Credit Associations - Institutions in the 'Middle Rung' of Development? Working Paper No. 148. Sociology of Development Research Center. University of Bielefeld.

Schrader, H. 1996: Informal Finance and Intermediation. Working Paper No. 252. Sociology of Develoment Research Center, University of Bielefeld.

Schrader, H. 1997: *Changing Financial Landscapes in India and Indonesia: Sociological Aspects of Monetization and Market Integration* . Market, Culture and Society 2. Münster etc.: LIT.

Selznik, P. 1995: From Socialism to Communitarianism. In: M. Walzer (ed.): *Toward a Global Civil Society*. Oxford: Berghan.

Sen, I. (ed.) 1990: *A Space Within the Struggle: Women's Participation in People's Movements* . New Delhi: Kali for Women.

Sen, A. 1993: The Economics of Life and Death. *Scientific American*: 40.

Sheng, Y.K. 1990: Community Participation in Low-Income Housing Projects: Problems and Prospects. *Community Development Journal* 25, 1: 56-65.

Smith, R.W. 1973: A Theoretical Basis for Participatory Planning. *Policy Science* 4.

Soeyono 1992: The Role of Community Participation in Human Settlement Planning in Indonesia: Focus on Kampung Improvement Projects and Programs. *Regional Development Dialogue* 13, 4: 17-20.

Spiegel, H.B.C. 1969: The Many Faces of Citizen Participation: A Bibliographical Overview. In: H.B.C. Spiegel (ed.): *Citizen Participation in Urban Development* . 2 Vol. Centre for Community Affairs, NTL Institute for Applied Behavioral Sicence. Washington DC.

Stephans, C. and T. Harpham 1991: *Slum Improvement: Health Improvement* ? London: School of Hygiene and Propical Medicine, PHP Department Publication No. 1.

Stone, L. 1989: Cultural Crossroads of Community Participation in Development: A Case from Nepal. *Human Organization* 48, 3: 206-213.

Stone, L. 1992: Cultural Influences in Community Participation in Health. *Social Science and Medicine* 35: 409-417.

Streethen, P. et al. 1981: *First Things First. Meeting Basic Needs in Developing Countries* . Oxford: Oxford University Press.

The World Bank 1975: Rural Development. Sector policy paper. Washington: World Bank.

Thomas-Slayter, B. et al. 1993: *Tools of Gender Analysis: A Guide to Field Methods for Bringing Gender into Sustainable Resource Management* . Virginia: Clark University.

Thomaßen, W. 1988: *Politische Partizipation und Stadtentwicklung* . München: Sauer.

Thudipara, J. 1992: Participatory Approach to Urban Development: Case Study of Indore Habitat Improvement Project. *The Indian Journal of Social Work* 53, 4: 621-627.

Tinbergen, J. 1964: *Grundlagen der Entwicklungsplanung*. Hannover: Verlag für Literatur und Zeitgeschehen.

UNDP 1990: *The Human Development Report.* New York: United Nations.

United Nations 1971: *Popular Participation in Development: Emerging Trends in Community Development*. New York: UN.

United Nations 1975: *Popular Participation for Decision-Making in Development*. New York: UN.

Uphoff, N. 1985: Fitting Projects to People; in: M. Cernea (ed.): Putting People First. New York: Oxford University Press.

Valk, P. and K.H. Wekwete (eds.) 1990: *Decentralizing for Participatory Planning?* Aldershot: Gower.

Viloria, L.V. 1992: Community Participation in Marginal Settlements in the Philippines: The Case of Metro Manila. *Regional Development Dialogue* 13, 4: 22-33.

Walzer, M. 1995: The Concept of Civil Society. In: M. Walzer (ed.): *Toward a Global Civil Society*. Oxford: Berghan.

Waseem, M. 1982: Local Power Structures and the Relevance of Rural Development Strategies: A Case Study of Pakistan. *Community Development Journal* 17, 3: 225-233.

Wieringa, S. 1994: Women's Interests and Empowerment: Gender Planning Reconsidered. *Development and Change 25*, 4: 829-848.

Williams, S. 1994: *Gender Training Manual*. Oxford: Oxfam.